

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

OCT 10 2006

REMARKS

The claims have been substantially amended to address the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph and the prior art rejections under 35 U.S.C 102 and 103. It is believed that the claims now pending in the subject application are patentable and allowable over the prior art cited and relied on. Reconsideration of the application and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested in view of the following discussion.

Claims 33-39, 41-67, 69-93, 100-105, 106-108, 124 and 125 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite as set forth on page 2 of the Office Action. The various informalities noted therein have been corrected by the presented claim amendments. Regarding the use of the term "reference variable", this has been replaced throughout the claims by "reference value."

The remaining pending claims stand rejected under 35 U.S.C 102 or 103 as being anticipated by or rendered obvious by U.S. Patent No. 3,510,036 to Lewis et al., either taken alone or in combination with U.S. Patent No. 6,106,177 to Siegl et al. Applicants respectfully submit that these rejections are traversed in accordance with the changes made to independent claims 33, 35 and 124.

As noted in the previously filed Amendment of March 30, 2006, the Lewis reference is directed to solving the same general problem to which the subject application is directed, however, there are substantial differences in the two solutions. In the present method and device, as recited in claims 33, 35 and 124, there is provided a computing unit which is provided with various informational characteristics of the material which forms the web being processed. As discussed in the specification, these characteristics may include web weight, web dimensions, historical information relating

to the behavior of the web in response to its being subjected to ink and dampening fluid and the like. All of these pieces of information are used in the computing unit to arrive at a function which will be provided to the regulating unit in order to reduce the tension in the web in anticipation of the imminently occurring web tension affecting interference. The web tension is thus maintained at its usual level during web splicing. The web tension is not merely automatically reduced to a single lower level, which is not web characteristic related or dependent. Thus the method and apparatus of the subject invention, as set forth in currently amended claims 33, 35 and 124 is not anticipated by, nor rendered obvious over the Lewis reference.

In the Office Action, the Examiner notes that the aforementioned distinctions are not present in the claims. This has been rectified by the present amendments to each of independent claims 33, 35 and 124. Also, claim 34 has now been made dependent on claim 33. In particular, each of the independent claims now specifies that the computing unit generates a time based, predetermined web tension control function or correlation in response to a sensed web tension affecting interference and that the control function or correlation is dependent on information regarding the material from which the web is formed.

In addition, the Examiner contends that Lewis et al. disclose the claimed computer device with reference to the computer circuitry 92 which belongs to the upper half of FIG. 2 in Lewis et al. However, the computer circuitry 92 has nothing to do with the process by which the web tension is reduced during splicing of a new roll, which is described in col.10, lines 7-37. The referenced delay circuit does not interact with the

computer circuitry 92. Thus, the disclosed computer circuitry in Lewis et al. does not anticipate the recited computing unit in claims 33, 35 and 124 as amended.

Applicants respectfully submit that the foregoing changes to the claims clearly distinguish the claimed invention over Lewis et al. since Lewis is silent on the concept of reducing web tension using a control function or correlation that is dependent on the material which forms the web. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the prior art rejections of the pending claims are traversed and that the application is now in condition for allowance. Allowance of the application is therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /wab/  
William A. Blake  
Reg. No. 30,548

October 10, 2006  
JONES, TULLAR & COOPER, P.C.  
P.O. Box 2266 Eads Station  
Arlington, Virginia 22202  
(703) 415-1500  
Attorney Docket: W1.1941 PCT-US